

MEMO

To: Lester Snow
Mary Scoonover
Mike Heaton
Eugenia Laychak
From: David Fullerton
Subject: Calfed Assurance Work Plan
Date: June 23, 1997

This memo responds to Mary's request that we each sketch out where we see the Assurances Workgroup going for the next meeting and for the next 6 meetings. I will start with my ideas on the longer term, then project them back to short term.

Summary of Workgroup tasks

1. Gather and Develop Information
 - a. Understand stakeholder needs
 - b. Understand how the needs of different stakeholders interact
 - c. Based first upon a case study, then upon the preferred alternative:
 - i. Articulate what CALFED Program implementation entails, functionally
 - ii. Analyze various implementation structures.
 - iii. Analyze various integrated packages of assurances.
 - iv. Analyze how implementation approaches and assurance approaches interact
 - d. Develop criteria for assessing the relative value of implementation structures and assurances
2. Narrow and Refine Implementation Approaches and Assurance Approaches
 - a. Based upon the results of Section I, reject implementation concepts which appear to have little chance of being selected.
 - b. Based upon the results of Section I, reject assurance concepts which appear to have little chance of being selected.
 - c. Prepare a detailed report, containing:
 - I. A summary of preceding work, including rationales for rejected approaches
 - ii. A detailed analysis of surviving implementation structures

- iii. A detailed analysis of surviving integrated assurance packages
 - iv. A detailed analysis of the pros, the cons, and the practical consequences of the remaining implementation structures, based upon the criteria already developed.
 - 1. For the CALFED-like structures, even at the risk of offending existing agencies, this must include an appraisal of the limitations of existing agencies and questions about the ability of so many agencies to work together on into the future.
 - 2. For new structures, it must include an appraisal of the difficulties entailed in starting up a new agency, including resistance from existing agencies. Include concerns about further complicating matters by adding a third factor -- regulators, regulatees, and now implementors.
 - d. This approach would be consistent with a November publication of a draft EIR which did not include a preferred approach for Delta transfer. Both the transfer question and the accompanying implementation/assurance packages could be worked out simultaneously. Thus, the Assurances report would represent a fairly refined analysis of the possible so that those discussing and negotiating the CALFED alternatives will have something to work from
3. Post Report Work
- a. Work with BDAC and stakeholders to develop a fully articulated preferred alternative.

Additional Tasks Needed

Based on these proposed tasks, we still quite a bit of additional work to do.

- 1.d Develop criteria. The Guidelines we have at present really need to be worked on and vetted by the entire group.
- 2.a-d. Most of these tasks remain, though preceding work has laid a foundation for us to work from.

Proposed Workplan

Meeting 1.

- 1. Present a fully articulated case study, including:
 - o Bolster the case study description to include
 - o A schedule of implementation.

Lester Snow
Page 3
June 23, 1997

- o More detailed operational rules
 - o Select an implementation structure. I prefer looking at the new entity. It is a credible alternative, but will also raise difficult issues. We can always back off into a JA or a CALFED approach without much new analysis.
 - o Articulate the implementation structure in detail.
 - o Articulate the assurance package in detail
 - o Evaluate the package, showing strengths, weaknesses, where resistance to the structure might exist.
 - o Create a set of standard "challenges" -- extended drought, climate change, default, ESA species recovery.
 - o Evaluate the alternative using these challenges.
- 2. Present an outline for a second case study -- a through Delta-alternative

Meeting 2.

1. Present a refined list of evaluation criteria, building upon the guidelines and the "challenges".
2. Present a list of implementation functions -- tasks that need to be performed.
3. Present the second case study equal in detail to the first, based upon the through-Delta alternative.

Meeting 3.

1. Finalize the evaluation criteria
2. Finalize the implementation functions paper
3. Finalize the case studies

Meeting 4

1. Present a paper describing the edges of the credible implementation/assurances envelope, based upon the preceding papers.

Meeting 5

1. Finalize the implementation/assurances envelope paper.

Meeting 6

1. Present a preferred alternative?